

~~MANAGEMENT IN CONFIDENCE~~
SEA SYSTEMS CONTROLLERATE INTERNAL MINUTECONTINUATION SHEET

2. It appears that the reason d'etre for seabed storage is twofold:
 - a. To remove submarine from public view/concern
 - b. To allow time (60 years!) to decide on a permanent method of disposal for the reactor.

The proposal presumably assumes that the retrieved hull in its deteriorated state will be decided to have the reactor compartment removed for disposal. The seabed storage option appears to be a short term expedient which could make the final disposal problem more difficult. Has consideration been given to removing the ends of the submarine and stowing just the reactor compartment in the seabed? Presumably both deposit and retrieval could be done as a heavy lift, the maneuvering problem would be reduced, the tow could be dispensed with as could the settling/densifying systems.

3. Unless storage on the seabed is the only way of reducing the radiation risk to the public to an acceptable level, it would seem preferable to keep the hull afloat so that its condition can be monitored and maintained. (Presumably SSN1 does not present a risk to the public alongside at least!)

P. A. Beirne

Post script. A copy of the reference has been forwarded to ADNA/MT.